BACONIANA.

VOL. X. *Third Series.* JULY, 1912. No. 39.

BACON'S MASKS.

BACON published in 1623 the "De Dignitate et Augmentis Scientiarum," generally known simply as his "De Augmentis." This work is described as the "Tomus Primus," the first part of "The Great Instauration," the second part of which was his "Novum Organum," published three years earlier, viz., in 1620.

The "De Augmentis" of 1623 was placed in various public libraries, magnificently bound in velvet and silver. Whether it was ever sold I am uncertain; my own copy is marked "Ex done Authoris." An edition of this work was brought out in English in 1640 under the title of the "Advancement of Learning." In the "De Augmentis," 1623, Book VII., page 2, we read (I quote from pp. 2 and 3 of King Charles I. copy of the English edition of 1640 in my library):

"For writings should be such, as should make men in love with the Lessons (italics) and not with the Teachers (italics) . . . As for myselfe (Excellent King) to speak the truth of myselfe, I have often wittingly and willingly neglected the glory of mine own Name, and Learning (if any such thing be) both in the works I now publish, and in those I contrive for hereafter; whilst I study to

advance the good and profit of mankind. And I, that have deserv'd perchance, to be an Architect in Philosophy and Sciences, am made a Workman and a Labourer, and at length anything else whatsoever; seeing I sustaine and work out myselfe, many things that must needs be done; and others out of a naturall disdaine shift off and refuse to do."

Page 3, on which the above concludes, is falsely headed Book VI. instead of VII. to call attention to the passage, while in my own special copy of the 1645 "De Augmentis," Lib. VII. is Rosicrucianly marked, perhaps 200 years ago, in the same manner as certain books that ought to be included in my unique library are still marked in catalogues sent to me from abroad. Bacon himself thus tells us in the clearest way that he often writes under pseudonyms, and is going to continue to do so. This was in 1623, and almost immediately thereafter appeared the 1623 folio of "Mr. William Shakespeare's" plays, the title page of which is adorned with what every tailor now tells us is a dummy clothed in a trick coat composed of the back and front of the left arm. The dummy is surmounted by a mask to teach those capable of understanding that the figure is a left hand, a mask, a pseudonym under which the great author wrote secure.

On pp. 132 and 133 is shown a full size photo facsimile of the portion of pages 2 and 3 of Book VII. of the 1640 "Advancement of Learning" which contain the important words which I have quoted. Anyone with ordinary eyesight and a good glass cannot fail to perceive that the whole is in very mixed type, and indeed it is perfectly certain that they involve a biliteral cypher. They, therefore, are printed here in order that those acquainted with the method of decyphering such writings may possibly enlighten us as to the statement hidden beneath the obvious meaning, which is, however,

by itself a revelation quite clear and distinct that Bacon has of set purpose put aside his name in works that he has already published, and in those he is contriving for the future. As I have said, the 1623 folio of the plays came out almost at the same time as the "De Augmentis," and there appeared also in 1623 an edition of Sidney's "Arcadia," the title page of which is headed by a hog with a slip knot round its neck to show us that it is a hanged-hog, a Bacon. The hanged-hog is covered with a porcupine's skin (Sidney's crest was a porcupine) and it also has porcupine's feet to teach us that Bacon wrote under the porcupine's skin and, as it were, with the porcupine's hand, the works known under the name of Sir Philip Sidney.

In "Du Bartas," translated 1605 by Joshua Sylvester, at B2, we find a wonderful Beacon (Bacon) emblem, which tells us quite clearly, if we have sense enough to understand it, that Sidney is really nothing, and that "Our Apollo," "world's wonder," the "rare more-than-man" is in fact Bacon.

EDWIN DURNING-LAWRENCE.

imbred Pride and vaine-glory, men have made choice of ſuch ſubjects of Diſcourſe, and of ſuch a manner & method of handling, as may commend rather their own wit, than conſult the Readers profit. *Seneca* ſaith excellently, *Nocet illis eloquentia, quibus non rerum facit cupiditatem, ſed ſui.* For writings ſhould be ſuch, as ſhould make men in love with the *Leſſons*, and not with the *Teachers*. Therefore they take a right courſe, which can openly avouch the ſame of their Counſils, which *Demoſthenes* once did, and can conclude with this clauſe, *which if you put in execution, you ſhall not only commend the Orator for the inſtant, but your ſelves likewiſe, not long after, in a more proſperous ſtate of your affaires.* As for my ſelfe (Excellent KING) *to ſpeak the truth of my ſelfe, I have often wittingly and willingly neglected the glory of mine own Name, and Learning, (if any ſuch thing be) both in the works I now publiſh, and in thoſe*

I contrive for hereafter; whilest I ſtudy to advance the good and profit of mankind. And I, that have deſerv'd perchance to be an Architect in Philoſophy and Sciences, am made a Work-man and a Labourer, and at length anything elſe whatſoever, ſeeing I ſuſtaine and work out my ſelfe, many things that muſt needs be done, and others out of a naturall diſdaine ſhift off and refuſe to doe. But, (to returne to the matter) which we were about to ſay, *Philoſophers in Morall Science, have choſen to themſelves a reſplendent and luſtrous maſſe of matter, wherein they may moſt glorify themſelves, for ſharpneſſe of wit, or ſtrength of Eloquence: but ſuch precepts as ſpecially conduce to practice, becauſe they cannot be ſo ſet out, and inveſted with the ornaments of ſpeech, they have in a manner paſs'd over in ſilence.* Neither needed men of ſo excellent parts, to have deſpaired of a fortune like that, which the Poet *Virgil*, had the confidence to promiſe

BACON'S WARWICKSHIRE RELATIONS.

IN "Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries" Mrs. Stopes has collected very useful and interesting information about the county families in Warwickshire in Shakespeare's time. The original idea of the author, as she tells us in the preface, was to select certain families on account of some relation, real or imaginary, which she believed they might have had with William Shakespeare. She thought it might be of interest to students of Shakespeare to know something of his Warwickshire contemporaries.

To a student of Bacon the book is interesting, because of the actual and personal relations which existed between Francis Bacon and the Lucys of Charlecote, the Comptons of Compton Wyngates, the Cookes of Hartishill and Highnam, the Gooderes of Polesworth, and other county families in Warwickshire with whom Bacon was intimately acquainted. But it must be small comfort to those Shakespeareans who are ever seeking to give distinction to obscurity, when they find throughout the book the most convincing proof that, in spite of tremendous industry and research, the only sort of association which is traceable between these families and William Shakespeare is simply geographical. William Shakespeare lived at Stratford in Warwickshire, and these families owned and occupied considerable estates in the same county. That is absolutely the only connection between them. There is no evidence that Shakespeare ever crossed their thresholds or even spoke to any member of these Warwickshire families. There is not a fact which suggests that, if the Stratford player at any time visited Charlecote, he did not enter the mansion house of the Lucys by the back-door.

The wills of the Cooke family at Somerset House and other documents at the Record Office contain information about Bacon's Warwickshire relations which may be of interest to Baconians.

Bacon's grandfather, Sir Anthony Cooke, was a wealthy landowner holding large estates in the counties of Essex and Warwickshire. He died in 1576, his wife, the daughter of Alderman Fitzwilliam, having predeceased him, and by his will he divided his property among his two sons, Richard and William. The manors of Mawdlyn, Lavor, Markalesbury, Haughams, and Withers in the county of Essex, he devised to his second son, William (afterwards Sir William Cooke), in accordance with his covenant with Lady Gray contained in his son's marriage settlement. To his eldest son, Richard, he devised the residue of his real estate, which included Giddy Hall and lands in Essex, as well as the manor of Hartishill and other lands in Warwickshire, which he had purchased from Sir Thomas Culpepper in the reign of Henry VIII. His magnificent library he bequeathed to Richard and to Richard's son, Anthony, who subsequently became a patron of literature ; two Latin volumes and one Greek volume were given to his daughters, Burleigh, Bacon, Russell, and Killigrew, according to their own selection. The lease of his farm in the Isle of Thanet, with the stock and cattle upon it, he left to Richard and William jointly. Among the legacies, £500 to William, £50 to Lady Oxford, £20 to Anthony and Francis Bacon and Robert and Elizabeth Cecil ; to the lord of Leicester the choice of two stone horses in Havering Park ; and £200 a-piece to Lord Burleigh and Sir Nicholas Bacon as executors of his will.

The residue of his personal estate he left to his son Richard, who only survived his father three years. Under Richard's will his widow, Anne Cooke, became

entitled for life to Giddy Hall and estates in Essex, as well as lands at Thetford, in Lincolnshire. To his son Anthony (afterwards Sir Anthony Cooke) he left all his armour and weapons and library of books at Giddy Hall, a farm in Devonshire, and lands in Warwickshire. To his daughter Philippa, who married Hercules Meautys, he bequeathed £100, and legacies of £20 apiece to his niece Elizabeth Cecil and his nephews Robert Cecil, Anthony and Francis Bacon, Edward and Thomas Posthumous Hoby.

When Francis Bacon returned to England, in 1579, his cousin Anthony Cooke was a landowner in Warwickshire. He had inherited the fine library of his grandfather at Giddy Hall, and as a patron of literature he befriended Michael Drayton, the poet, who began life as a page in the household of Sir Henry Goodere, the owner of estates at Polesworth and a neighbour of the Cookes at Hartishill. In Drayton's "Amours," published in 1594, there is a sonnet dedicated to Anthony Cooke, whom the poet describes as "my kind Mæcenas." A letter from Anthony Cooke, dated the 19th July, 1592, to Anthony Bacon, whom he repeatedly addresses as "sweet cousin," shows the friendly relations that existed between them, and that Bacon had rendered some kindness to his cousin, for which the latter had "a thankful heart and ready hand" to serve him.

Sir William Cooke, the second son of Sir Anthony Cooke (Bacon's grandfather), died in 1589. In the previous year he had bought from Sir Henry Goodere, of Polesworth, and his daughter Frances Goodere, the tithes of Hartishill, which were conveyed by deed to Sir Wm. Cooke, Francis Bacon, and Weston Shaw (Cooke's servant), the latter two apparently being trustees, for the codicil refers to the purchase of the tithes of Hartishill in 1588 and directs the trustees to hold them on behalf of the testator's wife.

Sir William Cooke's estate included a house and garden in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields; a house in Thames Street; manors at Hocford (Devon), Hartishill (Warwick), and Langport (Kent); a lease of the rectory of Mickle Kirk, which he bought of Robert Morley for £1,400; and a large estate in Bucks purchased from Henry Lee for £2,800 in 1587, the conveyance being to Sir Wm. Cooke, Francis Bacon, and George Throckmorton, of Fullbrook. Francis Bacon was one of the executors of the will with Sir Henry Gray, Sir Henry Killigrew, and James Morris, cousin of the testator, and as family trustee he became responsible for the maintenance of the widow, his aunt (Anne Cooke), and the education of the younger children, out of the income of Sir William Cooke's estate.

The letter in Spedding dated the 29th October, 1593, from Francis Bacon to his aunt Cooke, shows that the executors were in receipt of revenue from (*inter alia*) the property at Hartishill and the rectory of Mickle Kirk.

The Cookes, who had been landowners in Warwickshire since the reign of Henry VIII., were naturally on terms of intimacy with the Lucys of Charlecote and the other county families in Warwickshire. William Cooke, Bacon's cousin, a student at Gray's Inn in 1592, played the part of captain of the bodyguard to the Prince of Purpoole in the *Gesta Grayorum* in 1594, and subsequently became Clerk of the Liveries. He was a frequent visitor at Charlecote and Highnam, and became engaged to Joyce Lucy, the daughter of Sir Thomas Lucy, of Highnam, and grand-daughter of the Sir Thomas Lucy who was then lord of the manor of Charlecote.

Joyce Lucy was an heiress on her mother's side and was entitled to the manors of Kingsholm, Highnam, and Rudford, in Gloucestershire, which had be-

longed to her great-grandfather, Sir Nicholas Arnold. Her mother, Lady Dorothy Lucy, died in 1581, and from that time her father, Sir Thomas Lucy, claimed to hold these Gloucestershire estates in right of his wife by the courtesy of England. There seems to be some doubt whether he could have sustained his claim by courtesy, because it is stated that his wife had not entered into possession of the estates, having died a few months after she succeeded to the inheritance. It appears, however, that no one questioned his claim until his daughter became engaged to Bacon's cousin, Sir William Cooke, who took up the cudgels on behalf of his fiancée.

Sir William found that Sir Thomas Lucy was arrogating to himself the right of granting substantial leases on these estates, and he objected to this encroachment on the daughter's inheritance. Sir Thomas, in a rage, complained to his daughter, and even tried to persuade her to break off the engagement, suggesting that Sir William only sought to marry her for her property. The situation might have been critical, but, possibly on the advice of Bacon, the family trustee, conciliatory counsels prevailed. Joyce Lucy succeeded in persuading Sir William to humour her father, and the lovers agreed to allow him to enjoy the estates for life. [This bit of family history is set out in the pleadings in a Chancery case in 1607, and the record bears the signatures of William Cooke, Joyce Cooke, Francis Bacon, and John Seman, doctor of laws.]

The undated letter from Francis Bacon to Sir Thomas Lucy, which is misplaced by Spedding, was obviously written about this time. Francis is pleased to hear of the success of his cousin, and rejoices at the union of the Cookes and the Lucys. "This bond of alliance," he assures Sir Thomas, "shall on my part tie me to give all the tribute to your good fortune upon all occasions that my poor strength can yield."

Sir Thomas had asked Bacon, as family trustee, for a statement as to the property qualifications of his prospective son-in-law, and Bacon accordingly sends him an account of his cousin's lands of inheritance, which included estates in Essex, Bucks, and Warwickshire, together with his rents, woods, and royalties. He mentions "one lease of great value," which is probably the lease of the rectory of Mickle Kirk mentioned in Sir William Cooke's will.

As to the portion to be brought into settlement, Bacon suggests that it is a matter for his cousin's discretion. "Out of this, what he will assure in jointure," he gracefully writes, "I leave it to his own kindness, for I love not to measure affection." He had every confidence in his cousin, and a high regard for his character. "I doubt not," he says, in conclusion, "your daughter might have married to a better living, but never to a better life; having chosen a gentleman bred to all honesty, virtue, and worth, with an estate convenient. And if my brother, or myself, were either thrivers, or fortunate in the Queen's service, I would hope there should be left as great an house of the Cookes in this gentleman, as in your good friend Mr. Attorney General (*i.e.*, Sir Edward Coke or Cooke). But sure I am, if Scriptures fail not, it will have as much of God's blessing and sufficiency, as ever the best feast," etc. ("Resuscitatio," Part I., "Letters," p. 76).

The marriage of Bacon's cousin and Joyce Lucy was in 1598, a year full of romantic adventure for the Comptons, another Warwickshire family with whom Bacon was intimately acquainted. Lord Compton was a fellow-member of Grays Inn when Bacon was Treasurer. His father-in-law, Sir John Spencer, Lord Mayor of London, was admitted at Grays Inn in 1595, on the day after the banquet which he gave in honour of the Prince of Purpoole at Crosby Place. Sir John

Spencer was a friend of both Anthony and Francis Bacon, helping them in their financial difficulties and lending them money from time to time. In 1593 he purchased some of Anthony's estates in Herts, Essex, and Cambridgeshire, for the sum of £3,380, and in the following year he bought Crosby Place in Bishopsgate Street, where Anthony had taken a town house a few months earlier. Edward Spencer, a nephew of Sir John, was employed by Anthony Bacon to look after his estates at Gorhambury (Spedding, Vol. I., p. 310).

Lord Compton became attached to Elizabeth Spencer, only child of the wealthy cloth-worker, who was generally known as "Rich Spencer" and had offered to settle £40,000 on his daughter's marriage. The father objected to Lord Compton as son-in-law, and his protests led to an unseemly domestic feud. Compton took the violent course of having Spencer imprisoned in the Fleet, alleging that he had ill-treated his daughter. Ultimately Elizabeth eloped from Cannonbury House, and was married to Lord Compton. The method of her escape recalls the scene in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, where Sir John Falstaff is carried out of Mistress Ford's house in a linen-basket. It is said that Sir William bribed a baker to allow him to deliver the bread one morning at Canonbury House, and having emptied the bread-basket of its loaves he placed Elizabeth in it and carried her away (see BACONIANA, Vol. VIII., 1900).

Lord Compton, who was a constant attendant at the Gray's Inn dramatic entertainments, took the part of a shepherd in a pageant in 1610 which caused some comment. "The moral I cannot tell," writes William Alexander, "unless to signify that my Lord Spencer, his father-in-law, was a great sheep-master, and that he fared much better for the weighty fleeces of his sheep" (Hist. MSS. Various, Vol. III.).

On the death of Sir John Spencer in 1611, Lord Compton oppressed with sudden wealth, we are told, went mad. Within eight weeks he spent £72,000, mostly on horses, rich saddles, and play. The Earl of Suffolk begged the custody of him, and would have seized his money and jewels at Canonbury, but his mother, the Countess of Dorset, playing the valiant virago, held him at bay and he was defeated ("John Pym's Note Book").

When Bacon was Attorney-General he took a lease of Canonbury House from Lord Compton for forty years from 1614.

Sir William Cooke married twice, and died in 1618. In his will he expresses the wish to be buried at Highnam, where his first wife, Joyce, was buried, and he mentions his second wife as Rodogane, or Radegund. His son, Robert, succeeded him in the office of Clerk of the Liveries (S. P. Dom., 1603, June 21).

There is an interesting document in the Record Office from which it appears that Sir William Cooke held certain lands in Herts as one of the trustees on behalf of Francis Bacon. The entry in the State Papers is as follows:—

"1608. Jan. 31. Grant, at the suit of Sir Francis Bacon, to Sir Wm. Cooke, of Highnam, Sir John Constable of Grays Inn, (& 3 others) of the King's reversion of certain manors etc. in Herts, formerly assured by Sir Nicholas Bacon, Ld. Keeper, to his sons Anthony and Sir Francis in tail male, remainder to himself and his heirs, which descended from him to Sir Nicholas Bacon, his eldest son, who conveyed the same remainder to the late Queen Elizabeth, her heirs and successors, *with the condition that if he paid £100 the grant should be void, which was apparently done to prevent the sd Sir Francis to dispose of the same land which otherwise by law he might have done.*"

The largest landowner in Warwickshire was Bacon's friend, Fulke Greville, whose ancestor, William Greville of Campden in Gloucestershire, bought the manor of Milcote, in Warwickshire. Fulke Greville's grandfather married the greatest heiress in England, and Beauchamp Court became the family seat; an estate in Warwickshire called Wedgnock Park was presented to Fulke Greville by Queen Elizabeth, and King James gave him the ruined castle of Warwick.

Fulke Greville, like his cousin, schoolfellow, and life-long companion, Sir Philip Sidney, has a reputation which far exceeds his achievements. In that interesting history, "A Cotswold Family," the authoress writes: "The name of Fulke Greville stands—and yet it is impossible to say how or why—for all that is sweet and fine in English character." He was undoubtedly a charming personality and a great favourite at the Court, having much private access to Queen Elizabeth. And it is worth noting, for those who are ever ready to denounce Bacon as a "place-hunter," that it was this courtly gentleman who stirred up Bacon to use his influence with friends at Court and stimulated his ambition for the office of Solicitor-General.

Greville evidently thought that Bacon, the man of contemplations, was not sufficiently energetic in pushing his claims, and so far from thinking it derogatory to press for promotion in those days, he certainly recommended it. "Awake your friends," he writes in May, 1594: "I have dealt with Sir John Fortescue and my Lord of Essex by letter. Neither will I neglect the rest for you."

It was with Greville's approval that Bacon shortly afterwards made a present of a jewel to the Queen, "which she refused but with exceeding praise," and at the end of his letter he writes: "Either I deceive myself or she has resolved to take it, and the conclu-

sion was very kind and gracious, so as I will lay £100 to £50 that you shall be her Solicitor and my friend."

In the Essex rebellion, which so inevitably made havoc of bonds of friendship and ties of blood, Greville, who was a kinsman of Essex, formed one of the party engaged in the assault upon Essex House from the waterside; and but for the surrender of the rebels, it might have fallen to his lot to take the life of his kinsman.

Greville became Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1614, when Bacon was Attorney-General, and he was one of the Council responsible for the torture of Peacham, an incident for which Bacon has been so unjustly condemned.

HAROLD HARDY.

"SHAKESPEARE AND RELIGION."

THE *Times* newspaper, either for the sake of consistency or because of pressure by its influential writers, still affects to disregard the belief of an ever-increasing number of educated persons that the plays ascribed to "Shakespeare," the actor, were not written by him. Therefore articles appear in that journal now and again based on an assumption of his authorship which is rapidly becoming a subject of derision. Such was the leading article of April 30th last on "Shakespeare and Religion," supporting a view taken by the headmaster of Eton in his sermon at the Commemoration Service of the Stratford Festival that "Shakespeare was not a religious poet." By "religious poet" Mr. Lyttleton cannot mean one like George Herbert, whose poetry was devoted to religious subjects, but must mean a poet who was not a religious man. It is, of course, desirable for those who deny the possibility of the plays having

been composed by Bacon to suggest that the true author was not a religious poet, for it is beyond controversy by any who have even glanced at the essays on "Unitie in Religion" and "Of Atheisme," to say nothing of his other writings, that the great philosopher was religious in the highest sense of the word. Therefore it would be something of a point made in favour of tradition if it could be established that the plays were, if not irreligious, at least devoid of religious spirit. It is, of course, fair to admit that there is no room within the limits of a leading article to do much more than hint that such a proposition could be maintained, but the grounds for even a hint in the paper in question are singularly insufficient. They consist as usual of quite unjustified assumptions. For example: "We may be sure," says the leader writer, "that if religion had been one of Shakespeare's chief interests, he would have expressed it not merely in occasional passages dramatically appropriate, but in the choice of his characters and the very structure of his plots." Why, let us ask, may we be sure of it? "Nobody," continues the writer, "can pretend he did so. Not one of his chief characters, either of those who seem to be drawn from his own experience, or from the closest and keenest observation, is religious, nor is religion a main interest in any of his plots."

The writer has left himself exits for escape from contradiction by the use of the words "chief" and "main." But, evidently disturbed by a doubt as to what he could answer to obvious retorts, he proceeds to anticipate one of them, and to deal with *Measure for Measure*. And thus:—"His plays are experiments not theses, and his peculiar power consists in representation rather than proof. There is no writer who takes so little for granted about life, or who seems so incessantly upon a voyage of discovery. Once or twice, as in *Measure for Measure* and *Troilus and Cressida*, he seems to start with a desire to

prove something; but in both cases he tires of it. *Measure for Measure* is only made into a play by means of a conventional ending, and *Troilus and Cressida* is no play at all, but a mere fragment concluded with doggerel by another hand." Here, indeed, is a series of the audacious and unfounded assumptions which the believers in the work of Shakespeare, the actor, are accustomed to make.

What ground has the leader writer for stating that the author of *Measure for Measure* seems to start with a desire to prove something and tires of it, and that it is "only made into a play by means of a conventional ending"? Is the "something" the unquestionable fact that the love of dignity, respect, justice, woman, life, and God is in many natures powerful? Surely no proof of that fact was necessary. Or is it that the love of God and divine laws is powerful? If not, what is it? and why is the author said to tire of his attempt to prove it? The play of *Measure for Measure* has a plot, purpose, characters with fine and consistent speeches attributed to each, their mutual relations are combined and the ending is natural enough.

The good duke tries an experiment of rule in his realm, and rather than that the experiment should end tragically he intervenes at the right moment. Why should this termination of a complicated situation be styled conventional? It may be hard to define a "chief character" in some plays, but unless the female part is to be treated as the subordinate one in most of those by Shakespeare, the *rôle* of Isabella is one of the chief in *Measure for Measure*. She is not only a novice in a nunnery, but her religion is true and invincible. The incorrigibly dissolute Lucio says to her, with unwonted reverence,—

> "I hold you as a thing ensky'd and sainted;
> By your renouncement, an immortal spirit;

> And to be talk'd with in sincerity ;
> As with a saint."—Act I., iv.

And the austere Angelo is fascinated by her saintliness rather than by her beauty. Her own language is not the mere phraseology of a convent, but that of a sincere Christian, as when in answer to his grim utterance,

> "Your brother is a forfeit of the law,
> And you but waste your words,"

she replies—

> "Alas, alas!
> Why, all the souls that were were forfeit once ;
> And He that might the vantage best have took
> Found out the remedy. How would you be,
> If He, which is the top of judgement, should
> But judge you as you are?"

Or seeks to bribe him, lawfully enough,

> "Not with fond shekels of the tested gold,
> Or stones whose rates are either rich or poor
> As fancy values them ; but with true prayers
> That shall be up at heaven and enter there
> E'er sun-rise, prayers from preserved souls,
> From fasting maids whose minds are dedicate
> To nothing temporal."—Act II., ii.

Nor can it be said that her incorruptibility under the highest temptation that could be offered to a maiden, viz., the prospect of saving her brother's life, was due merely to innate virtue.

> "'Sir,' she says to Angelo, 'believe this,
> I had rather give my body than my soul."

And when, with difficulty, he makes her pure mind comprehend his meaning,

> "Better it were a brother died at once,
> Than that a sister, by redeeming him,
> Should die for ever."—Sc. iv.

Her religious belief enables her to withstand the temptation. That belief is not treated by any of the *dramatis personæ* with contempt or reproach, nor is there a line in the whole play throwing doubt on it. But if *Measure for Measure* was the work of a sceptical man, the opportunity for scepticism was great. So much for that play. The reference to *Troilus and Cressida* in this connection is quite inexplicable and is perhaps a slip of the pen by the leader writer, who had some other play in mind. For neither religion nor irreligion enters into it at all. No occasional phrases on the subject are found in it, and it certainly is impossible to discover the "something" which the playwright is supposed to have started to prove by it.

The commentator on the headmaster's sermon, although saying "it would be easy, indeed, to write a book proving plausibly enough that Shakespeare was a universal sceptic," is inclined to acquit him of universal scepticism on account of the quality of his plays, but is good enough to inform us, from, we suppose, those hidden sources of information to which the believers in Shakespeare have access, that "he experienced many kinds of passions, but never, so far as we can tell, a great spiritual passion. He was still in the experimental stage of life when he died—that stage which many men pass before they are thirty, and in which so long as it lasts no man can attain to any unity and tranquility of conviction. Therefore it is not a reproach to him that he was not a great religious poet."

Indeed! But still let us hope that we may continue to read the plays on Sundays without shocking the headmaster of Eton.

J. R., of Gray's Inn.

THE SHAKESPEARE SONNETS.

Notes on Recent Articles.

WITH reference to Mr. Hutchinson's interesting article on the Sonnets of "Shakespeare" in your April issue, would you permit me to lay before your readers another view on the subject held by one who has been studying the problem for the last ten years or more. I entirely agree with Sir Sidney Lee, the late Mr. Gerald Massey, and other writers, that there is no doubt whatever that some of the Sonnets, including the first seventeen and the one hundred and seventh, were addressed to the Earl of Southampton, as first suggested by Dr. Nathan Drake, M.D., in the year 1817. When the Earl was seventeen years of age, that is to say, in 1590, his guardian, Lord Burghley, wanted him to marry Lady Elizabeth Vere, who was Burghley's grand-daughter and Francis Bacon's cousin. It was at that time Bacon's principal desire to please Lord Burghley in all matters, for it was from him he hoped to gain advancement; and no doubt the first seventeen Sonnets were all written with that object, for *in each and every one of them* the author tries to persuade the young Earl to marry. But in 1590 the Earl was already entered as a student at Gray's Inn, where Bacon had his chambers, and they were probably on very intimate terms, seeing that Bacon's uncle, Lord Burghley, was, as above stated, the Earl's guardian.

It is manifestly impossible that these seventeen sonnets could have been written by William Shakspere, an "obscure actor and former butcher's apprentice," who had recently arrived in London from a small provincial town, for why should he be writing sonnets to the Earl of Southampton urging him to marry? He had himself left his own wife, and how could he be on such familiar terms as to write to the Earl,

"—— dear my love, you know
You had a father; let your son say so."

I think there is no doubt that these seventeen sonnets were written by Francis Bacon, who, as being the nephew of the Earl's guardian, might without impertinence urge him to comply with his guardian's wish.

Let us now turn to Sonnet 107, which there is strong evidence to prove was sent by Francis Bacon to Lord Southampton in 1603, when the latter was released from prison on the death of Queen Elizabeth. The sonnet reads as follows:—

"Not mine own fears, nor the prophetic soul
Of the wide world dreaming on things to come,
Can yet the lease of my true love control,
Supposed as forfeit to a confined doom:
The mortal Moon hath her eclipse endured,
And the sad augurs mock their own presage;
Incertainties now crown themselves assured,
And peace proclaims olives of endless age.
Now, with the drops of this most balmy time,
My love looks fresh, and Death to me subscribes,
Since, spite of him, I'll live in this poor rhyme,
While he insults o'er dull and speechless tribes;
And thou in this shalt find thy monument,
When tyrants' crests and tombs of brass are spent."

Now we all agree, both Stratfordians and Baconians, that Queen Elizabeth is intended by the words in the fifth line, "the mortal Moon"—for Cynthia, or the moon, was her recognised poetic appellation; and the epithet "mortal," with the rest of the line, shows that it refers to her death. As Sir Sidney Lee states, the sonnet "makes references that cannot be mistaken to three events that took place in 1603—to Queen Elizabeth's death, to the accession of James I., and to the release of the Earl of Southampton." That is so; but the following facts show that the sonnet was written by Bacon:—

1. The expression "eclipse endured," in the fifth line, also occurs in Bacon's "History of Henry VII.," where it refers to another Queen Elizabeth; and no further example of this expression has been found elsewhere, although great efforts have been made to discover one. Which fact alone would of itself seem to indicate that the Sonnet and the History were written by the same person, namely, Francis Bacon.

2. But I think we have actually got the covering letter in which the sonnet was enclosed, for Bacon wrote to Southampton a brief note on this occasion congratulating the Earl on his release, and saying, "this great change hath wrought in me no other change towards your Lordship than this, that I may safely be now that which I was truly before." The sonnet and letter were Bacon's vain attempt at a reconciliation, for Southampton's imprisonment had been, in a great measure, due to Bacon's action at the trial of Essex, and doubtless the Earl "supposed" that all "true love" between them had been "forfeited" by his "confined doom."

3. The reader will note in the sonnet the words "fears" and "incertainties"; also "peace" and "drops of this most balmy time"; and here are some extracts from Bacon's writings about this date:— "Therefore it rejoiced all men to see so fair a morning of a kingdom. . . . Many were glad that the *fears and incertainties* were over blown. . . . Yet we account it but a fair morn before sunrising, I see not whence any weather should arise. . . . We cannot but take great comfort in the state which we now stand in of grace and unity with all Christian princes."

4. There is also the well-known parallel passage in Bacon's "History of Great Britain" beginning, "It had been generally dispersed by the fugitives beyond the seas," which, as has been pointed out by several writers,

gives *in extenso* the substance of the two opening lines of the sonnet. Mr. R. Davies, writing in the *Westminster Gazette*, in February, 1910, observed, "the more closely the passage is examined, the more closely will it be seen to resemble the lines."

The above parallelisms will, I think, convince most readers that this sonnet was addressed by Bacon to Southampton in April, 1603; but some of the other sonnets were apparently written by Bacon for his friend, the Earl of Essex, to send to Queen Elizabeth. Thus, for instance, Sonnet 125, beginning—

"Were 't aught to me I bore the canopy,"

was probably written for this purpose, for Essex is supposed to have been one of the bearers of the "rich canopy" under which the Queen was brought through the long west aisle of St. Paul's Cathedral "to her travers in the quire" when she attended the thanksgiving service after the destruction of the Spanish Armada. The words "suborned Informer" in the penultimate line evidently refer to some third person (possibly Sir Robert Cecil) who had been supplying the Queen with information adverse to Essex.

Sonnet 57 was also manifestly sent to the Queen, who, it will be remembered, Bacon said, liked to have sonnets addressed to her. The sixth line, as originally printed, reads,—

"Whilst I (my soveraine) watch the clock for you."

Elizabeth was the Sovereign when that sonnet was written.

SAMUEL WADDINGTON.

15, Cambridge Street, Hyde Park, W.

Mr. Hutchinson kindly sent the MS. copy of his article to me, which I read with much in-

terest, and was gratified to find that one very important section in his argument has been anticipated by me in some MS. additions which will be published if a second edition of my "Studies" ever appears. I cannot assent to his view that all the Sonnets are of the nature of soliloquies—addressed to a man's own soul. There are many sets of Sonnets—some of self-communion, others dramatic, others addressed to particular persons, such as Essex, the Queen, &c. *Ex. gr.*, I cannot see that Sonnet 57 could have been intended for anyone but "my sovereign," Queen Elizabeth, who called the youthful Bacon her "watch candle." Much of this is discussed in an article on the Sonnets which appeared in the number of BACONIANA for February, 1894, p. 181. My recent note runs thus:—

"BACON ON FRIENDLY PRAISE AND SELF-PRAISE.

"In his 'Essay of Friendship' Bacon writes, 'How many things there are which a man cannot with any face or comeliness say or do himself. A man cannot allege his own merits, much less extol them. But all these things are graceful to a friend's mouth which are blasting in a man's own.'

"This sentiment is reflected with curious exactness in many passages in Shakespeare, *ex. gr.*:

> "'Oh, how thy worth *with manners* may I sing
> When thou art all the better part of me?
> What can my own praise to my own self bring?
> And what is't but my own when I praise thee?
> Even for this let us divided live
> And our dear love lose name of single one,
> That by this separation I may give
> That due to thee which thou deserv'st alone.'"
>
> —"Sonnet" 39.

Observe the dexterity with which the poet applies the sentiment to his *alter ego*. This is soliloquy, but two

separate persons are referred to—the poet himself and the lady whom he loves.

"The worthiness of praise *disstains his worth*
If that the praised himself brings the praise forth;
But when the repining enemy commends
Then breath fame blows, that praise sole pure transcends."—*Tro. Cr.* I. iii. 241.

"All tongues, the voice of souls, give thee that due,
Uttering bare truth, even so as foes commend."
—"Sonnet" 69.

"But soft, methinks I do digress too much
Citing my worthless praise. O pardon me,
For *when no friends are by men praise themselves.*"
—*Tit. A.* V. iii. 16.

"Then we *wound our modesty*, and make foul the clearness of our own deservings, when of ourselves we publish them."—*All's W.* I. iii. 4.

In all these passages there is something akin to the sentiment referred to in Parallel 62, p. 273, in the "Studies," where praise is spoken of as the expedient of a seller who wishes to commend to the buyer the value of that which he wishes to sell.

Mr. Hutchinson regards all the Sonnets as belonging to one order—self-communion. Any reader, without any preconceived hypothesis, must find many varieties both of occasion and import; and by any doctrinaire reading the beauty and interest of those matchless poetic creations evaporate.

R. M. T.

BACON IN ITALY.

(*Continued.*)

HAD Shake-Speare wished to picture young Francis Bacon modest and eager, purposeful, dignified, with a mind exceptional and brilliant as he first left home for the Continent, he could not have given us a better portrait than young Sir Proteus in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*.

The Play opens with his beloved consort Valentine making his farewell *en route* for Milan.

Two Gentlemen of Verona, ACT I., SCENE I.

Valentine.—Cease to persuade most loving Proteus. Home keeping youth have ever homely wits. . . I would rather entreat thy company to see the wonders of the world abroad, than living dully sluggardised at home, wear out thy youth with shapeless idleness.

Proteus.—Wilt thou begone, sweet Valentine? Adieu! Think on they Proteus when thou haply seest some rare note-worthy object in thy travel."

Bacon all over, who says: "Those who have had experience in foreign countries must tell younger men what things are *worthy* to be *seen* and *noticed* in the country where they go." (Brit. Museum posthumous Latin copy of "Essay of Travel"). In other words What are "rare noteworthy objects?" (as Shake-Speare's Proteus calls them.

SCENE III.

Panthino (To Anthony, Proteus' father.—He is speaking of Proteus' uncle, evidently a great person who had been holding him in confidential chat in a cloister).

"He wondered that your lordship would suffer him to spend his youth at home, while other men of slender reputation put forth their sons to seek *preferment* out . . . some to the wars . . . some to the studious Universities, and did request me to importune

you to let him spend his time no more at home, which would be great impeachment to his age in having known no travel in his youth."

Here we have Bacon again, who begins his "Essay of Travel": "Travel in the younger sort is a part of education, in the elder a part of *experience*."

Anthony (*Proteus' father*).—I have considered well his loss of time and how he cannot be a perfect man not being tried and tutored by the world. *Experience* is by *industry* achieved.

Bacon's "Advice to Sir George Villiers, on Embassies to Foreign Princes," contains the information that towardly young noblemen in Elizabeth's time (by the advice of some secretaries or principal counsellors) were "sent forth into several parts beyond the seas . . . to be trained up, and made fit for public employments and to learn the languages"; gaining such *preferment* as might be worthy of them, "and as by their *industry* their deserts did appear." Thus Shake-Speare is as suggestive and compelling with regard to the *preferment*, *experience*, and *industry* to be achieved by young travellers as Bacon himself, and *vice versa*.

Anthony.—Tell me whither had I best send him?

Panthino.—I think your lordship is not ignorant how his companion, youthful Valentine, attends the Emperor in his Royal Court?

Anthony.—I know it well.

Panthino.—'Twere good I think your lordship sent him hither. There shall he practice *tilts* and *tournaments*, hear sweet discourse, converse with noble men, and be in eye of every exercise worthy his youth and nobleness of birth.

Bacon runs pretty parallel to this in his same "Essay of Travel," except that he takes the trouble to add, In foreign lands "Triumphs, and Masks, and such Shows are not to be neglected." In his "Advice to Villiers" he not only advocates *Masques*, *Revels*, and

Interludes, but *Tilts* and the *Barriers* for the Lords and chivalry of the Court.

Anthony.—Well hast thou advised. I will despatch him to the Emperor's Court.

Francis Bacon says in his "Advice to Villiers" with regard to the expenses of Lieger Ambassadors and those with them that were "hopeful to be worthy of the like employment" that "their charge was always borne by the Queen, duly paid out of the exchequer . . . the reward of their service, they were to expect it on their return, by such *preferment* as might be worthy of them, and yet be little burden to the Queen's coffers."

A good-humoured little hit at Elizabeth from Francis, who knew just where the shoe pinched!

These young hopefuls' "care was" (says Francis) "to give true and timely intelligence of all occurrences, either to the Queen herself or to the Secretaries of State, unto whom they had their immediate relation. Their charge was always borne by the Queen, duly paid out of the exchequer." He repeats this, showing the fact is of some importance.

Mr. Smedley in an interesting article, "The Mystery of Francis Bacon," BACONIANA, 1911 [pp. 69—96] points out that Bodley, the diplomat (employed by Queen Elizabeth at this time in foreign embassies) provided Francis Bacon with money for his travels. Shake-Speare deals with this similar subject of travelling expenses with regard to his Proteus.

Anthony [to Proteus].—"What I will I will and there an end. I am resolved that thou shalt spend some time with Valentinus at the Emperor's Court; What maintenance he from his friends receive, like *exhibition* thou shalt have from me. To-morrow be in readiness to go. Excuse it not for I am peremptory."

As peremptory as William Cecil, the Lord Treasurer Burleigh himself, who, I verily believe, is the "uncle"

referred to (apparently quite unnecessarily) in the third Scene of the first Act of the play.

Anthony.—Tell me Panthino, what sad talk was that (earnest talk) wherewith my brother held you in the cloister?

Panthino.—'Twas of his nephew Proteus, your son, etc., etc.

The cloisters, as I take it, were the leafy cloisters of Hatfield, in which ancient Pergola still hangs a bas-relief of Elizabeth and her courtiers. *Panthino*, I think, was *Pa-Anthony, Père Anthony*, Sir Anthony Cook, Lady Bacon's father and Francis' tutor; and the "uncle," *Lord Burleigh*, Francis' uncle, armed with authority from the Queen to arrange for Francis' sudden removal from England to Paris, at her expense. Mr. Smedley says he has reasons for thinking Lord Burleigh at this time had a share in the travelling projects of his nephew Francis. With regard to this point let us note carefully what *Anthony* (Act I., Scene iii.) (speaking of Proteus' loving friend *Valentine*, who was already away) says:

"What maintenance he from his friends receives, like exhibition thou shalt have from me."

In Johnson's Dictionary we find after this quotation another from Bacon to explain the meaning of the word *exhibition*—"Only a pension or *exhibition* out of his coffers." Exactly! The term is used still in our universities for a sum derived from some special fund for the allowance of scholars. The sucking diplomatists, as Bacon tells us in his "Advice to Villiers," received such allowance for travelling expenses from the Queen's coffers. And Francis, being her 'green envoy,' was entitled to such an *exhibition* and received it, as Proteus did also.

In this most interesting and fruitful study let us, as Bacon says in his "Henry VII.,"

"Make our judgment upon the things themselves, as

they give light, one to another, and as we can dig truth out of the mine."

There is a point which I wish particularly to emphasize in Bacon's "Advice to Villiers"; it is that "towardly" young intelligencers who went abroad at the desire and charge of the Queen—"*travelled but as private gentleman*"; in other words, *incognito;* in other words, *under feigned names.* Some think there is difficulty in the way of D'Estissac being young Bacon *incognito*, because on September 16th and October 18th, 1580, two letters appear to have been written by Bacon to Lord Burleigh and to Lady Burleigh, dated from Gray's Inn; also on February 13th, 1581, there is a letter from Anthony Bacon written from Bourges to Burleigh, giving directions to Francis and others to send him letters through Italian merchants instead of through the Embassy. But if Elizabeth and her ministers were anxiously keeping Italian and Portuguese journeys of young Francis private, then the obstacle created by Gray's Inn and Anthony Bacon's letters vanish into thin air. For Francis, in fear of his life, to send to England letters which were shown about (perhaps to suspicious Mendoza, the Spanish Ambassador in London), and which were to be docketed and kept as State papers for over three hundred years—letters inscribed with Gray's Inn in one corner of them—was for a diplomatist as *easy as lying*—easy, too, was it to get Walsingham's political agent, Anthony Bacon, to add in 1580 the name of Francis to any list of stay-at-homes he mentioned in his home letter, even though he very well knew his brother, instead of being in Cony Court, was engaged in secret negotiations in Milan or Lisbon.

It is interesting to know what a successful and clever young diplomatist Francis was already at 15—how useful to his Queen and country; for only after a very few

months from his first landing in Calais he received this encomium from Amyas Paulet, the English Ambassador in Paris. "Of great hope, endued with many and singular parts, who, if God gave him life, would prove a very able and sufficient subject to do her Highness good and acceptable service."

Young Francis, honoured from babyhood with the personal interest and favour of the Queen, later her constant counsellor in matters of State—as Rawley, his biographer, takes care to tell us—may be seen still more excellently pictured in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (Act II., Scene iv.):—

Duke of Milan.—You know him well?

Valentine.—I knew him as myself . . . Sir Proteus, for that's his name, made use and fair advantage of his days. His years but young, but his experience old, his head unmellowed, but his judgment ripe, and in a word . . . he is complete in feature and in mind with all the good grace to grace a gentleman.

Duke.—This gentleman is come to me with commendations from great potentates and here he means to spend his time awhile.

Shake-Speare and Francis Bacon are certainly one in thought and expression. Bacon says: "A man that is young in years may be old in hours, if he have lost no time" ("Essay of Youth"). The Prince of Morocco in the *Merchant of Venice* says: "Young in limbs, in judgment old"; and old Bellario in his letter to Portia in the same play says exactly the same thing: "I never knew so young a body, with so old a head."

And now I resume the thread of what is called "Michel de Montaigne's Diary." It is written in two scripts—one said to be that of a secretary; the other that of Montaigne. If this is so or not, I don't pretend to know. At present I can't tell you anything definite about the MSS., even where it is. The Directeur of the *Bibliotheque Nationale* in Paris assures me it is not there.

It has, as we know, always been held to be an important document for its knowledge of Italy in the sixteenth century. Professor Dowden in his "Life of Michel de Montaigne" (French Men of Letters Series, edited by Alexander Jessop) says the original MS. has disappeared. Why should it have disappeared? 1774 isn't such a *very* long time ago. Professor Dowden makes the strange remark (as we saw in the October number, 1911) that Montaigne "still challenges criticism," "*eludes us,*" and asks, "*How shall we capture Proteus,* and induce him to sit for his portrait?" Proteus again! Who and what is Proteus? Of Proteus we hear nothing in Bacon's "Wisdom of the Ancients," but L'Emprière says:—Some think he was the son of Neptune and Phœnicia; he had prophetic powers, and reposed on the sea-shore, where such as wished to consult him generally resorted. He was difficult of access, . . . and by assuming different shapes eluded the grasp of his enquirers. On the shore of very troublous seas did Francis Bacon repose; "his head stood but tickle on his shoulders," as he tells us in Mrs. Gallup's most interesting cipher. L'Emprière says that to elude questions Proteus disappeared in a flame of fire, a whirlwind, or a rushing stream. Solid, prosaic Michel D'Eyquiem never did that; but our Proteus, who, elusive beyond question, was exiled at 15 from the Verulam woods (the glory of Gorhambury to Hampstead), just as Proteus was exiled from Verona, may have quite possibly flown off to France, Italy or Portugal when his duller-pated friends in Gray's Inn thought he was safe in Coney Court immersed in law.

In the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* we see the inconstancy of man, a favourite theme with Shake-Speare, and the particular inconstancy of calf-love pictured in Proteus, who transfers his boy-love from Julia to

Madam Silvia, who, though she was the beloved of Valentine, toys with Proteus and sends him her picture to dote on.

Is Julia, Lady Hatton in her girlhood, the relation of the Cecils? She more than likely was his child companion at Hatfield and Gorhambury. May she not have been one of the cogent reasons why Burleigh, a wily Polonius, was eager to ship him off abroad? She received an offer of marriage from Francis, we know, in after life. Valentine, I think, may not unreasonably be set down as Anthony Bacon.

Every critic assures us the *Two Gentlemen* is a play of Shake-Speare's earliest period. "Natural and unaffected," Pope calls it. Certainly a specimen of what Knight calls the "new school of art," with "thoughts natural and obvious, familiar and general." It contains quite an illuminating touch about Italy in its "outlaw" episode. Some may imagine Shake-Speare went back to Sherwood and Robin Hood for that, but our poet reflected the true images of the nature of his time in his mirror.

D'Estissac and Montaigne, on leaving Bologna, had intended to travel *via* Ancona and Loretto, but, being warned that "*bannis*," or outlaws, infested Umbria, they changed their route. Bandits swarmed in Bologna, too; heavy sums were offered for their heads. Amongst them were some of the Orsini, Savelli and Piccolomini, one of which noble family, Alfonso, Duke of Montemarciano, boasted he had despatched three hundred and seventy persons before he was twenty-five. It seems he marched upon Rome in 1581 to "do" for the Pope at the head of two hundred merry men, was pardoned, and under the protection of the Grand Duke, was presented to the King and Queen-mother of France and became quite the fashion.

With this interpolation, necessary as linking Shake-

Speare on to Montaigne, we pass with him through the *Porta del Popolo* into Rome. During the four and a-half months spent there our traveller was present at the hanging of one of the worst of these outlaws.

Catena, who had kept all Italy in dread, was the author, it was said, of particularly shocking assassinations. Our traveller evidently considered the execution of malefactors a necessary part of his experience. He remarks upon the Italian mode of quartering their bodies *after death* as having great results upon the spectators; no doubt censuring in his wide heart the horrible cruelty of disembowelling them before execution, as was the habit in England in Trafalgar Square, on the spot where Charles I. statue now stands. The diary describes the Brothers of Pity, wearing cloaks and masks of cloth, and numbering amongst them gentlemen and "other distinguished individuals of Rome." It tells how two of these accompanied Catena upon the scaffold and afforded him the last consolations of religion, and how they held a picture of our Lord near to the man's face so as to prevent those in the street seeing it, and this even at the gibbet (a beam between two posts), and till he was thrown off the ladder. Was Catena really executed, or did a Barnardine or a Raggozine suffer for this Claudius? It is quite worth reading Act IV. Scene iii. of *Measure for Measure* with "Montaigne's Diary" on one's desk. It assures one how familiar the author of that play was with the execution of malefactors in Italy, whose prisons and scaffolds were brightened for them with the offices of Dukes and other pitiful members of its highest society; doing as Duke Vicentio did, saying as he said:

"Induced by my charity, and hearing how hastily you are to depart, I am come to advise you, comfort you, and pray with you."

Hanging was the death prepared for Barnardine ac-

cording to the Clown, but in speaking to the Duke in prison Catena said :

"I will have more time to prepare me, or they shall beat out my brains with billets."

This found its counterpart in Rome on January 14th, when Montaigne saw the execution of two brothers who had slain their master by night in the palace of Signor Jacomo Buoncompagno, the Pope's son. He says : "This execution took place on a scaffold, where the criminals were first knocked down with heavy wooden clubs and then their throats were cut. It is, so the report goes, a form of punishment used in Rome from time to time."

The lodging of our traveller was the "*Albergo del Orso,*" the Bear Inn. It stands close by the Tiber, and has lately undergone much cleansing and painting. It is at the corner of two streets, one of which, the "*Via del Orso*" (once the "*Sistina*"), was so called from the marble bear that stood at the corner of the *Via del Soldato.* The Inn is a poor enough place now, but has traces of better times about it. Its octagonal pillars are said to show that it dates from Pope Sixtus IV., a hundred years anterior to Montaigne's visit. From that time "great people, foreign cardinals, travellers of distinction who wished to preserve their incognito during several days, earliest known tourists (among whom is Montaigne), and those seeking their fortunes in Rome, all drew reign at the Bear."

So says the foot note in the diary. A cryptic emblem remains as part of the old stone moulding round one of the rooms upstairs—a convoluted horn or *cornu.* The owner could give me no account of why it was there alone and conspicuous on the white-washed walls, said to hold some of the deep secrets of Rome. I wished the day I stood there that they would speak.

Quite near stands the ruined theatre of Marcellus, within whose amphitheatre rose the fortress of the Orsini, making one wonder if the Albergo was a part of the family property. The Orso family was represented in Montaigne's time by Ludovico Orsino, and he is the privileged man who not only possessed a palace, and a private chapel within the precincts of the Theatre of Marcellus, but was allowed to give his name to Duke Orsino in *Twelfth Night*.

Ludovico, Esme, Stuart, Duke of Lenox, in love with Countess Arabella Stuart was, as I have already shown in BACONIANA,* the great original of Duke Orsino, and he lived in a house near by the Thames at Blackfriars, close against the Fortress of Baynard's Castle, the Blackfriars Chapel and Black Friar's Theatre. The Nevils (their crest the Bear and Ragged Staff) owned a fine house and garden on the same bankside. The Orsini, Savelli, and Colonni all used the Bear and its Column in their crest.

It seems a far cry from Rome to Blackfriars, were it not imperative to show how often in Shake-Speare's Plays we get touches of sunny Italy, and of Bacon's travels there.

Take for instance the lines in *Twelfth Night*, Act II., Scene iv. :

> *Duke Orsino.*—Oh, Fellow, come, the song we had last night! mark it, Cesario; it is old and plain, the spinners and the knitters in the sun, and the free maids that weave their thread with bones, do use to chant it.

The most complete explanation of this speech comes to us in "Montaigne's Diary." At Empoli, under a July sun, he makes a special point of seeing the peasants on their festival Sunday threshing, and spinning, pon-

* "New Light on *Twelfth Night*," Vol. II., pp. 103—106, 215—227; Vol. IV., pp. 46—54.

dering over the "*Contadini* with lutes in their hands and even the Shepherdesses with Ariosto on their lips." What better evidence can we have that Montaigne and Shake-Speare are one and the same? This description of the spinners and singers in the sun is surely poetic enough even for the author of *Twelfth Night*.

Ariosto, we know, collected the old songs of the people, and the peasants of his time sang them. Rizzio, I believe, did the same. Our traveller only stayed at the Orso two days, but he took rooms close by in the *Via di Monte Brianzi*, in front of the Church of *Santa Lucia della Tinte*. He says he might have had lodging at the *Vaso D'Oro* near, but the furniture being such as kings use, all silk and cloth of gold, he preferred not. As a fact, there was no *Vaso D'Oro* then—only a *Testa D'Oro*, which proves our philosopher thought a vase and a skull were identical.

Our traveller records the facilities given him for studying at the Vatican Library and seeing the precious MSS. there, particularly that of Seneca. He was able to make what extracts he pleased. Now, Ten Tragedies of Seneca were translated in Elizabeth's reign. John Newton, whoever he was, collected these in 1581. Did Francis Bacon use his privileges for giving England the benefit of a better knowledge of Seneca?

Walter Clodd, prefacing the Camelot series of the Morals of Seneca, calls Lodge a paraphraser, not a translator. Thomas Lodge had as little to do with this as Shaxpur had to do with the plays. Those who wish for Montaigne's impressions of Rome in detail must read the Diary. He saw the Ambassador of the Muscovite in scarlet and gold. Francis Bacon says, in his Political Tract, "The Muscovite Emperor of Russia . . . always at war with the Tartarians and now with the Pollacke . . . of late sent an ambassador to Rome, giving some hope to submit himself to that

See." The Diary says: "The Ambassador Muscovite also offered to make certain concessions in the religious controversies at present pending between himself and the Roman Church," adding that this Russian ambassador travelled through Poland disguised, of course, because of the war which Bacon tells us of. The Diary further says "this man's mission was to stir up the Pope to interfere in the war which the King of Poland is waging against his master." Montaigne was "persuaded that the full extent of ancient Rome was not yet realised, and that the greater part was buried." "All the knowledge I possess thereof," he says, "is of an abstract and contemplative nature, a knowledge in no way to be apprehended by the senses"—a fitting remark for one who was at once a high Rosicrucian and "a seer," as even Mr. Balfour admits. The ruins suggest to him "a reverence and respect, more than comprehension." He tells us "many of the old streets lie more than thirty feet below the level of those now in existence." We may think of him walking every day in the hilly quarter of the ancient city, re-peopling it with the forms of Julius Cæsar (whom he writes so intimately of in his prose works, as well as in the great play), of Brutus and Mark Antony. "It is easy to see," says the Diary, "by the Arch of Severus that we now stand more than two pikes' length above the ancient level, and that we walk on the tops of the old walls, which the rain and the coach wheels occasionally bring into sight." It will be remembered that the spot so long pointed out in the Forum as the rostrum where Mark Antony made his memorable speech, is close against the Arch of Severus. The lovely gardens of the Cardinals on Montcavalli, and on the Palatine and elsewhere, and the Villas of Pope Giulio and Madama (enchanting spots) are mentioned specially.

A full and enthusiastic description is given of Cardinal

Ippoliti D'Este's palace at Tivoli, the water-works of which, their musical organ, and singing birds, were, we are told, the great original of Pratolino. The Diary tells us in beautiful language how the "sun falling on the surface of the lovely fountains, make a rainbow so marked and so like nature that it in no way falls short of the bow seen in the sky." The statues there (taken from Hadrian's Villa) were of great merit and delighted him more than any others. At least, he describes them as copies mostly of the ones that pleased him so much in Rome. They are two Nymphs, one dead, one asleep, a Pallas "*celeste*," an Adonis, a wolf in bronze (there is one there now), "a boy extracting a thorn, like the one in the Capitol, the Laocoon, and the Antinous, the Comedy of the Capitol, a Satyr, and the copy of the recent work of the Moses, and a copy of the beautiful woman who sits at the feet of Pope Paul III. in the New Church of S. Peter's." He gives Rome a big compliment; he says while there he had no occasion for "melancholy which is my death, nor for sorrow, within doors or without," which makes one wonder whether after his departure from Paris his heart was as sore as Mrs. Gallup's cipher story would have us suppose. If so, this busy voyage was the best thing for him spiritually and physically. There is a touch of nature in the description of the pictures he saw of the Queen Mother of France and her children in the *Cesarini* Palace, for there he says hung "the Queen of Navarre." Poor Francis! He found the *Bella Clelia*, the owner's wife, "if not the most beautiful, assuredly the most amiable lady in Rome, or, for all I know, in the whole world." Gregory XIII., who Bacon describes at length in his Political Tract, is, as I think, "Old *Bellario*" of *The Merchant of Venice*. Law Lecturer and Reader of his University, where he was crowned with laurel in law (either Padua or Bologna, I don't know which),

he collected Gregory VII.'s Bulls in 1579, at the age of seventy-seven, under the title of *The Bullario*. And knowing some of his courtesies to our young envoy, and imagining there may have been plenty more, there is reason, I think, for our Shake-Speare immortalising the kindly old man. Indeed, I wonder whether the letter Lord Bellario wrote to Portia was one really indited by Gregory, for the use of Francis, and addressed to Moroni Master of the Jesuits at the English College, or to the Prefect of the Vatican Library.

At one audience Gregory, "with a courteous expression of face," admonished young D'Estissac to "study and virtue," but what happened at the others I do not know. That there were others I infer from the remark made that though our travellers *did not speak* at the one described, yet Montaigne says elsewhere: "The Pope's replies are brief and decisive, and it is loss of time to oppose them by fresh reasoning," and that "nothing will move him from a decision which he believes to be a just one." Bacon tells us he was "busy in practise," which I take to be negotiations. What secret negotiations Elizabeth and this "Supreme of the Princes Catholic" may have had together remains as yet "under the rose." Bacon says this Pope "had no great learning," while the Diary says "his idiom of Bologna was the worst in Italy," and that "in speaking he betrayed his Bolognese descent," which Bacon says "was from a father shoemaker." I should like to give an account of the cardinals that officiated with Gregory at High Mass on Christmas Day, and of the dinner parties and coach drives they gave our author. But I must close my already too long paper, reserving the end of Bacon's travels for another number.

Alicia Amy Leith.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON SHAKESPEARE'S CLASSIC DICTION.

THE classic diction of Shakespeare has been noted by many commentators. In my "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light" I have pointed out 230 English words used by Shakespeare in a classic sense. Mr. Reed, in his "Francis Bacon Our Shakespeare," has a similar list of 108 words. Many of those pointed out by Mr. Reed are the same as those included in my list; but Mr. Reed's list includes 59 words not in my list. The two lists combined give over 280 such words. Some of Mr. Reed's I have purposely omitted as being rather French than Latin—as *deracinate* and *legerity*; others I omit as belonging rather to legal technicalities than to current speech—such as *competitor, feodary, procurator.* Mr. Reed gives the words *have* and *haver,* which seem to me rather to illustrate classic construction than classic vocabulary. The two lists together prove the very remarkable classic quality of Shakespeare's language. Even ordinary, common-place words often illustrate this—such as *act, cast, success.* But probably no such list can be complete. Several others have occurred to me since writing my "Studies." I will add a few of these, some of which Mr. Reed has; but I add additional illustrations.

1. *Approve* occurs in neither of the two lists referred to. The current meaning of the word approve is *favourable moral judgment.* In this sense Shakespeare does not use the word at all. In the plays it takes the sense of the Latin word *approbo,* and is equivalent to intellectual corroboration, or confirmation, in which no moral judgment is implied. Thus, Horatio is sent for by Marcellus and Bernado that he may see the ghost of Hamlet's father, and confirm their report of it, that

"He may *approve* our eyes, and speak to it."
(*Ham.* I. i. 29).

And we are reminded that

"In religion
What damned error, but some sober brow
Will bless it and *approve* it with a text?"
(*Mer. V.* III. ii. 77).

As a favourable moral judgment is expressed in this passage by the word *bless*, the addition of approve would be tautological—which Shakespeare never is—unless the classic sense is implied. And so in another passage from *Ant. Cl.* V. ii. 149,—

"Nay, blush not, Cleopatra, I *approve*
Your wisdom in this act."

Here the favourable moral judgment is expressed by the word *wisdom*, which is thus said to be recognised, admitted. That the existing current meaning of the word was usual in Shakespeare's time is proved by quotations given in the Oxford Dictionary, which are represented as implying "pronounce to be good, commend." And quotations are given from Wycliff (1380), Bockenham (1447), and Starkey (1538).

2. *Astonish.* Mr. Reed quotes,—

"No, neither he, nor his compeers by night
Giving him aid, my verse *astonished*." (*Son.* 86).

To which may be added the following from *Julius Cæsar* I. iii. 55,—

"It is the part of man to fear and tremble
When the most mighty God by tokens send
Such dreadful heralds to *astonish* us."

The classic meaning of the word *attono, attonitus*, accounts for this meaning. *Attonitus* is rendered in Andrews' Latin Dictionary by — struck by thunder; hence, tropically, stunned, terrified, stupefied, alarmed,

astonished, amazed, confounded, thunder-struck. Thus Virgil writes,—

> "Talibus attonitus visis ac voce deorum."
> (*Æn.* III. 172).

And Juvenal, referring to the panic in Rome after the defeat of the Consuls at Cannæ, has,—

> "Incertam, attonitamque videres
> Hanc urbem, veluti Cannarum in pulvere victis
> Consulibus." (*Sat.* XI. 199).

Bacon, in his prose writings, wrote a letter to the king, advising him to call a Parliament (A.D. 1615), and adds, "They will say that the experience, and success [*i.e.*, result,—the classic sense] of the last two parliaments doth both intimidate and *astonish* them to try the same means again" (*Life* V. 176).

And in his Latin, "Reliquiæ autem, ita fabricas intuentur attonitæ, ut ad simplicitatem naturæ non penetrant" (*Nov. Org.* I. 57); which Spedding translates, "The others are so lost in admiration of the structure," etc. Perhaps *overpowered* or *mastered* would give the meaning of the Latin word more accurately.

3. *Convive* (Reed):—A truly remarkable piece of Latinity,—

> "All ye peers of Greece, go to my tent,
> There in the full *convive* we."
> (*Troi. Cres.* IV. v. 27).

Conviva is a table companion, and the cognate verb *convivor* means to feast, to banquet, or carouse together. Thus we have,—

> "Ergo superbum
> *Convivam* caveo, qui me sibi comparat res
> Despicit exiguas." (*Sat.* XI. 129).

"He shuns the proud fellow-feaster who makes in-

vidious comparisons between his own splendour and my plainness."

4. *Congruent.* Mr. Reed very aptly quotes,—

> "Government, being put into parts
> *Congrueth*, with a natural concent, like music."
> (*Hen. V.*, 4th ed., I. ii.),

> "By letters, *congruing* to that effect
> The present death of Hamlet."
> (*Ham.*, 4th ed., IV. iii.).

The Latin word means suitable, appropriate, tending to. Mr. Reed comments, "First use of this word in our language, introduced directly from the Latin. For some unknown reason, probably because it was not understood, the printers of the Folio (1623) changed it, in both these passages, into the motley form congreeing. Modern editors, however, not satisfied with this work of mutilation, have again changed it, in one case into *conjuring*."

5. *Insult*, in my list, is given as equal to *insulto*, leap or spring on anything, hence to treat abusively. My cousin, William Theobald, tells me that the sense of leaping or springing must be remembered in order to explain the following passage,—

> "Now am I like that proud, *insulting* ship
> That Cæsar and his fortunes bore at once."
> (*1 Hen. IV.* I. iii. 138).

The *insulting* ship is the vessel that bounds from wave to wave over the sea.

Bacon speaks of Saul's death, "It was a good end, lest a heathenish people should reproach the name of God by *insulting* on the person of Saul" (*Life* II. 117).

6. *Persecute.* Latin, *persequor*, follow perseveringly, continually. "He hath abandoned his physician, under

whose practise he hath *persecuted* time with hope" (*All's Well* I. i. 14).

7. *Prosecute.* Judge Webb, speaking of the 1623 Folio, says: "The Epistle Dedicatory reminds me in many respects of Bacon's Dedications. The style of the composition is not that of ordinary actors. The 'Incomparable pair of Brethren' are said, for instance, to have *prosequuted* the author of the plays with favour. This use of the word prosecute is not found in any English dictionary. It is, in fact, one of those Latinisms which Bacon habitually affected, and the origin of which is to be found in such Ciceronian expressions as 'Posidonium honorificis verbis prosecutus est,' and 'Equitem Romanum beneficiis ac liberalitate prosequebantur'" (*Webb's Myst. of Wm. Sh.*, p. 99).

Thus far Judge Webb. The following may be taken as other lights on the use of the word: "Licet humanam rempublicam, patriam communem, summo prosequamur amore, tamen legislatoria illa ratione et dilectu uti liberum non est" (*Prodromata, Works* II. 690).

Dr. Rawley, Bacon's chaplain, said of Bacon that he had no children, but "the want of children did not detract from his good usage of his consort, whom he *prosecuted* with much love and respect, with many rich gifts and endowments" (see *Montagu's Life of Bacon*, p. 474).

8. *Quantity.* The Latin word *quantitas* is not applied to numbers or material masses, but to values, greatness, moral or intellectual extent. This appears in the following,—

> "Things base and vile, holding no *quantity*,
> Love doth transform to form and dignity."
> (*M. N. D.* I. i. 232).

"Pardon Sir! Error. He is not *quantity* enough for that

worthy's thumb [Hercules] ; he is not so big as the end of his club" (*L. L. L.* V. i. 137).

> "I love thee, I have spoken it,
> How much the quantity, the weight as great
> As I so love my father." (*Cymb.* IV. ii. 17).

9. *Sacred* is used in another sense than that referred to in the chapter in my "Studies" on the classical diction of Shakespeare :—

In *Tro. Cres.*, *sacred* is used in a very remarkable way, quite impossible for anyone but an accomplished classical scholar,—

> "But the great gods gainsay
> That any drop thou borrowed'st from thy mother,
> Thy *sacred* aunt, should by my mortal sword
> Be drained." (*Tro. Cres.* IV. v. 132).

Dyce explains that the Greeks gave to the uncle the title of *sacred*—pater avunculus sacer. Steevens says, "This circumstance may lead to establish an opinion I have elsewhere expressed that this play was not the entire composition of Shakespeare, to whom the Greekism was probably unknown."

It is interesting to see how some such alternative as the Baconian to the undivided authorship of Shakespeare, forces itself into the view of the most orthodox Shakespeareans.

A Chapter on Philosophia Prima.

Reside is a word used by Bacon in the sense of its Latin origin. It does not mean inhabit or dwell, but takes the sense of *resido*, *residere*, settle down, like dregs or sediment. In the curious discourse on Persian magic ("Life," III., 89—99) he dwells on the difference between *compositio* and *mistio*, the one being a "conjunction of bodies in place only, the other in consent and quality." Bodies only united by *compositio* soon separate ; only agitation keeps them

together; when it ceases one settles down to the bottom and the union ceases. "If bodies be united by *compositio*, how weakly and rudely do they incorporate. For water and earth maketh but an imperfect slime if they be forced together by agitation. Yet upon a little shaking the earth *resides* at the bottom." The word *reside* is a convenient synonym for settle; the expression "settle down" having been already employed. In Shakespeare this sense seems to be implied in one case:—

> "Right and wrong,
> Between whose endless jar [while kept together in place by agitation] justice *resides* [the right and wrong being accurately separated, justice is the result]."
>
> —*Troilus and Cressida*, I., iii., 116.

Here we see a case of conjunction combined with conflict,—"with endless jar" or agitation, followed by accommodation, or settlement. The more current sense of the word *reside* is possible, but the Latin sense is stronger, deeper, more interesting, and therefore more Shakespearean, and more applicable to the context.

The whole passage from which these two lines are taken (*Troilus and Cressida*, I., iii., 75—137) is a profoundly philosophic discourse on *conjunctio and mistio*, and its application to all things—civil, individual, material or spiritual. It is a magnificent chapter out of the *Philosophia Prima*. The theme is degree,—rank, order; the necessity of proper distinction between different ranks of the same thing, or special arrangement of different things, which may meet either amicably or in conflict.

In a beehive if the queen bee is not one to whom all the foragers, or travelling bees, are subject, no honey is produced. If a face is hidden by a mask, no one can tell whether the hidden face is superior or inferior. Even the earth itself and all the planets move

in different spheres, and the movements of no two meet in conflict. Should the planets wander—their orbits confused "in evil mixture" — disaster would result, plagues, portents, earthquakes, whirlwinds, storms and ruin would result; the harmonious unity in separation would be violated and destruction become universal. So with schools, brotherhoods, commerce, primogeniture and family distinctions, the lawful rights of elder and younger sons, all the prerogatives of age, crowns, sceptres, laurels, would be dissipated. The music of all things would be changed to discord, and all things when they meet would meet for warfare, as if a river should forsake its banks and make the solid land an "imperfect slime," the earth itself a morass; what is strong would triumph over what is weak; the rebel son would kill his father; force would rule, not right; the endless conflict between right and wrong, out of which justice emerges, would cease; and if power is supreme, power itself is dominated by will, will is governed by appetite—and appetite, like a universal wolf, a devouring creature big as the world itself, would devour everything, and at last die itself of the inanition produced by its own ravenous rapine. If due rank and degree are choked and suffocated, and cease to breathe, life becomes chaotic, every one of lower rank despises the one above him, and all the conditions of civil life expire with the violences of the fever of universal surfeit.

This may be taken as a synopsis of this wonderful discourse. And in many other passages in Shakespeare we may light upon sections of the primary philosopher. One of these I have produced in BACONIANA for July, 1910, p. 157; the conclusion being drawn that Bacon was a philosophical mystic, and the Persian magic a reflection (in advance) of Swedenborg's doctrine of Correspondencies.

The Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy and Controversy in General.

"Do as adversaries do in law,
Strive mightily, but eat and drink as friends."

A friend to whom I sent a copy of my Autobiography, in acknowledging the receipt of the book, said he was interested in much that I had written, but differed from me both as to Bacon and Shakespeare, and as to Spiritualism. I wrote and enumerated some of the considerations which seemed to me to make it impossible to recognize William Shakspere, of Stratford-on-Avon, as the writer of the plays and poems. He wrote back, rather testily, and accused me of various unwarrantable assumptions. I replied, pointing out still more untenable assumptions on his own side, and then he was angry, and accused me of a "torrent of abuse," and such like unpresumable insults. After the exchange of one or two rather uncivil letters, I wrote urging him to discontinue the discussion. He replied that he would consent to live on terms of amity with me, but the only condition was that we should never talk about either Bacon or Shakespeare.

This is the point on which I desire to offer a few general considerations. The condition suggested is, I maintain, absolutely absurd and unreasonable. A peace which is based on a pact of suppression is a hollow and unsubstantial thing, and only means that the person who suggested it is quite sure that his opinion is infallibly right and permanently unalterable, and so the intellect becomes cataleptic, and imprisoned in its own notions. My friend considered that his arguments irritated my too *sensitive* spirit, and charged himself with "folly" and "indiscretion" in provoking the torrential current of abuse which he found in my reply. I consider that *he* was the sensitive person, not I; and that

any discussion whatever may be interpreted as containing imputations of personal stupidity, illogical thought, fallacious reasoning. But, good heavens! what does it matter? We are all apt to assume for our beliefs fixed and unalterable certainty, and attribute unwisdom or ignorance to our opponents. I have always looked with contempt on the conventional method of ending a discussion by "Enough! we shall never think alike; let us agree to differ." Nothing can be more cowardly than to end controversy on these terms, and only very sensitive and vulnerable disputants will terminate a discussion in this way. I prefer to say, "Of course we both agree and differ! If you like, we agree to differ; but that is no reason why we should not compare and discuss differences, and profit by *them*, as well as by agreement." And the self-accusation of "folly" and "indiscretion" in provoking a torrential stream of insult and abuse is really no self-accusation at all; it is a delicate form of self-flattery. The provocation alleged is so small, the result so enormous, that the self-accuser really places himself in a highly advantageous position at his adversary's expense, and claims for himself a superiority of logic and temper which a flattering friend would allege. I have often discussed, fiercely and mercilessly, with Roman Catholic friends on the unphilosophical nature of their tenets; their clinging for safety and certainty to an impossible human infallibity; their reliance in matters of reason on authority. As if mistake and error were not part of divine discipline, by which mind and character are shaped and strengthened. The intellect must pass through a Red Sea of salt and bitter waters before it can reach a land that "flows with milk and honey." Canaan is only reached by the passage of Jordan.

Personal discussion may be very active and resolute, and one party may feel injured by the arguments by

which he is confuted—as if his sanity or knowledge were questioned. My ever dear friend Langley (see p. 47 of my Autobiography) and I had fierce discussions on many topics, and if we differed we might have a dramatic quarrel — calling each other most unreasonable bigots, or idiotic reasoners, or dishonest debaters. But the quarrel was only histrionic—the personal affection and admiration unaltered, and unchangeable.

In controversy a lack of logic and of reasoning power may be imputed in any particular case, and the impeachment may seem to become too personal and the imputation of general unwisdom and ignorance assumed. But again I say, "Don't bother"; words are but imperfect instruments of expression. We are all apt to say a good deal more, and a good deal less, than we mean; and if, to avoid giving offence, we are to entrench ourselves behind a host of conditions, limitations, personal explanations, apologies, and so forth, we should only waste time and temper, and never be any nearer to an agreement worth having. Let us meet and talk about anything you like, however much our notions or opinions may differ,—Bacon or Shakespeare, Theology, Politics, Literature, Personal gossip, &c., I will say to my interlocutor, "I have much to learn from you, you have something to learn from me, and if we talk only about insipid matters on which difference is impossible, and avoid deep and subtle ideas which may be contemplated from many points of view, all I can say is we are timid and contemptible imbeciles, and deserve private apartments at Colney Hatch."

R. M. Theobald.

BACON AND GRAY'S INN.

GRAY'S INN has at last erected a memorial to her greatest son. The statue of Francis Bacon, which has been placed in South Square, was unveiled by Mr. A. J. Balfour on the 27th of June. It is a little difficult to know why the benchers decided to honour their former treasurer. There was no enthusiasm about the proceedings, which were confined to the delivery of a speech by Mr. Balfour and the drawing down of the screen with which the statue was covered. This, the final act of the comedy, was rather suggestive. When Mr. Balfour drew the cord which was intended to control the linen screen, it obstinately refused to come down, and the services of an attendant with a ladder were requisitioned to complete the ceremony. The reluctance of the screen appeared to be in accord with the sentiments of the benchers.

Mr. Balfour's speech was very commonplace. It was fitting that he should speak of Bacon as a lawyer; but it is doubtful whether he was accurate when he said that Bacon "did not rival in learning that eminently disagreeable person Sir Edward Coke." Still, he gave him credit for great breadth and mastery of legal principles, and suggested that his views on codification were in advance of his times. As a politician he lacked that personality which is a necessary element in every age for a man who would succeed in politics. So he was a failure there. Bacon's private life and character—what he was as a man—did not attract Mr. Balfour. Much worse men have had more interesting characters. Men have committed great crimes—"We condemn them," said the speaker, "but we are interested in them." Still, he admitted that the satire of Pope, and the rhetoric of Macaulay, had exaggerated the dark shadows upon Bacon's character. Bacon was, broadly

speaking, a successful man, for he was a philosopher and a statesman. There were no two professions which, in those days, gave the certainty of a more uneasy life or the chance of a more disagreeable death. Essex, Buckingham, Descartes, Galileo, and Giordano Bruno all passed uneasy lives, or suffered violent deaths, but Bacon died comfortably in his bed. "However dark may be our view of hereditary honour," said Mr. Balfour, "everybody will, I think, admit it is better to be made a viscount than to be burnt."

By the process of exhaustion there were three aspects of Bacon's life left to be considered—the man of letters, the historian, and the philosopher. The two first were dismissed with these words: "He was a writer of most noble prose—one of the men most happily gifted for history that this country has produced." There remained only his merits as a philosopher, and on this aspect Mr. Balfour dwelt at greater length. His fate as a philosopher had been mixed. "He has been magnificently praised by men whose praise is worth something, both in this country and on the continent of Europe. He has been violently abused by men whose abuse cannot be neglected, and—the worst fate of all—he has been vulgarised by some of his most ardent admirers." It was a mistake to assert that Bacon was a system maker. He had not the gifts to be an architect of a great system of thought. As Mr. Balfour understood him, he was a prophet and a seer. He spent much time in attacking his predecessors, and all must admit that he was unfair, and took a one-sided and a partial view of the efforts of the Greek philosophers. It was easy and quite true to say that in his system of inductive logic he did not produce, as he hoped to do, a great instrument of discovery. He overrated the coherence, consistency, and the accuracy of his inductive logic. It was not as a logician or as an inventor of a machine for discovery that Bacon lives.

"I call him a seer," continued Mr. Balfour. "What is it that he saw? What he saw was the neglect by the scientific mind, engaged in verbal disputes, of the patient and childlike attitude of those who come to nature, not to impose on nature their own ideas, but to learn from nature what it is that she has to teach us. . . . Many of his admirers speak as if his one claim to our gratitude was that if you examine nature impartially you will be always making useful discoveries. You can vulgarise this view of science and of discovery if you will, but you do great injustice to Bacon if you take that view. It is true that he always, as he said, looked on the estate of man with pity, and to improve the estate of man in succeeding ages was one of his great objects."

Mr. Balfour considered, however, that it was not until a century and a-half or two centuries after Bacon's time that the application of scientific principles to the augmentation of man's power over nature became effectual. The speaker continued: "You may say to me, 'Well, all this is very fine, this prospect of Bacon looking over the promised land from Pisgah, but not entering therein (to quote the famous phrase of Cowley's), but what has Bacon done for science?' I say that he did all that a great philosopher and a great writer, as distinguished from an investigator, can do. He created the atmosphere in which scientific discovery flourishes. . . . I hope that I have, at all events, suggested to you some of the reasons why all who love knowledge, all who love science, all who look now with pity on the estate of man, all who look forward to seeing that estate improved by the effort of thinkers, investigators, men of science, working together in the great co-operative effort of modern investigation—all who hold that view (and I think I have given you some reason why we should all hold it) will agree that I am performing no futile task

when I unveil a statue which, none too soon, the members of this ancient body have erected to him who lived here so long, who worked here so fruitfully, and who always held this place in loving recollection."

And then poor Bacon, in spite of Mr. Balfour's efforts, resolutely refused to show his face. Was he unaccustomed to listening to such extravagant flattery, or, after listening to the oration which had just been made, was he perplexed when he remembered how, in an age when wisdom was honoured, it had been said that his "profound and universal knowledge and comprehension of things then rendered him the observation of great and wise men, and afterwards the wonder of all"?

NOTES.

THE fifteenth stanza of Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece* contains a remarkable simile :—

"But she that never cop't with Stranger eies,
Could picke no meaning from their parling lookes,
Nor read the subtle shining Secrecies,
Writ in the glassie margents of such bookes,
Shee toucht no unknown baits, nor geared no hooks,
Nor could she moralize his wanton sight,
More than his eies were opened to the light."

The similitude between the lustful looks in Tarquin's eyes and the subtle, shining secrecies written in the margins of books is certainly very difficult of appreciation. The reference appears to be dragged in for some purpose. In view of this, the marginal letters of the verse are notable, B, C, N, W, Sh, N, M. It is also significant that Sh is the commencement of line 103, which number, in Bacon's system, represents the numerical value of Shakespeare. If the vowels are supplied it reads BaCoN, W.Sh, NaMe.

Mr. A. N. Whitehead in "An Introduction to Mathematics,"* published in the Home University Library of Modern Knowledge, draws attention to an instance of Macaulay's inaccuracy (page 156). He writes:—"Macaulay in his essay on Bacon contrasts the certainty of mathematics with the uncertainty of philosophy; and by way of a rhetorical example he says, 'There has been no reaction against Taylor's theorem.' He could not have chosen a worse example. For, without having made an examination of English text-books on mathematics contemporary with the publication of this essay, the assumption is a fairly safe one that Taylor's theorem was enunciated and proved wrongly in every one of them. Accordingly, the anxious precision of modern mathematics is necessary for accuracy. In the second place it is necessary for research. It makes for clearness of thought, and thence for boldness of thought and for fertility in trying new combinations of ideas. When the initial statements are vague and slipshod, at every subsequent stage of thought common-sense has to step in to limit applications and to explain meanings. Now in creative thought common-sense is a bad master. Its sole criterion for judgment is that the new ideas shall look like the old ones. In other words, it can only act by suppressing originality."

* Williams and Norgate, London.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Count D'Estissac and Francis Bacon.

DEAR SIR,—The articles on "Bacon in France" and "Bacon in Italy" which have appeared in recent numbers of BACONIANA contain so much interesting information and local knowledge that it seems ungrateful for anyone to complain about them; but as they are put forward in support of the proposition that Francis Bacon accompanied Montaigne upon his travels under the name of Count d'Estissac, it is important to call attention to the evidence which seems to be inconsistent with such a theory.

In the first place, it is suggested in the articles that the Count d'Estissac has not been identified (BACONIANA, Vol. IX. pp. 56—57), and that there is some sort of mystery by reason of the deference shown to him as the important member of the party.

But we are told by M. Louis Lautrey in his preface to Montaigne's Diary that Charles d'Estissac was the last male descendant of the ancient family of Agénois, which inherited the name and arms of d'Estissac; and that he was the son of the Lady d'Estissac to whom Montaigne dedicated one of his Essays (Bk. II. chap. 8), in which the author refers to the qualities of the young Lord d'Estissac, her son.

M. Lautrey also explains how it was that the Count took precedence in the ceremonies, *e.g.*, when kissing the Pope's toe in Rome, although Montaigne had general control over the tour, deciding where and how long they should stay, acting as guide, rather capriciously sometimes, as spokesman and chief of the party.

The Count d'Estissac was well known at the French Court, and bore letters of recommendation from the king and the queen-mother, which he presented to the Duke of Ferrara, the king's uncle. An Italian trans-

lation of these letters is preserved among the records at Modena. The king's letter is as follows :—

"The Count d'Estissac, desiring to render himself more worthy of continuing the service, which all his predecessors have always from ancient times performed to the State, is now on his way to Italy. His intention is to stay there some time and apply himself to the most virtuous and honourable practices which obtain daily, and because I desire in all that is possible to favour his journey, and to follow him in his wishes, I pray you, uncle, while he is staying in your country to show him all the kindness you can, in a manner that shall give effect to my recommendation, for he is a gentleman deserving favour."

The letter of Catherine de Medicis was in similar terms of commendation.

There appears to be, therefore, no mystery about the individual, his behaviour, or treatment.

Again, the information we have of Francis Bacon shows that he was in England at the time.

Montaigne started from home in June, 1580, and the Count d'Estissac joined the party at Beaumont on the 4th September, 1580, which is the date when the Diary begins.

If, therefore, Francis Bacon was the Count d'Estissac, he would have had to leave England in August, 1580, and his absence would have continued through the autumn and winter.

But in September, 1580, Francis Bacon wrote two letters from Gray's Inn, and the letter to Lord Burleigh of the 16th September, 1580, shows that an interview had taken place between Francis and Burleigh shortly before that date. The letter is written to remind Burleigh of the promise he made to Francis at that interview.

A later letter to Burleigh, also written from Gray's Inn, and dated the 18th October, 1580, shows that Burleigh had kept his promise and had tendered Francis' suit to the Queen. Francis might expect, therefore, to be summoned to the Court at any moment. Under these circumstances, it would be impossible for Francis to be travelling abroad, and the evidence that he was in England in September and October, 1580, seems overwhelming.

In one of the articles (BACONIANA, Vol. IX. p. 55) the writer says, "Until anything confutes my theory I shall believe that it was with his brother Anthony's friend, Michael D'Eyquiem de Montaigne, Francis journeyed." Accepting this, therefore, as an invitation to criticise, I hope I may be forgiven for setting out certain reasons for rejecting the theory.

HAROLD HARDY.

1, Hare Court, Temple.

The Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—May I be permitted to make known through your esteemed columns some deeply interesting points of suggested discovery relating to the above controversy? Like, probably, some of your readers, I favoured, for several years, the German theory that Bacon and Shakespeare were joint literary workers. How far that idea can be sustained in face of the fresh statements I am about to make, or with what finality these may be held to clinch the claim in regard to the sole Baconion authorship, I must leave your carefully studious and truth-loving readers to decide. In the valuable booklet just published by Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence appears a reproduction in modern script of Folio I. of the celebrated historic MSS. which were discovered at Northumberland House in the year 1867. On the top right-hand corner are the words

> "Mr. f frauncis Bacon
> of Tribute or giving what is dew."

Underneath are certain scrolls, about which the above author says: "I myself am in a particularly fortunate position with regard to these scrolls, because I possess a very fine large-paper

copy of 'Les Tenures de Monsieur Littleton,' 1591. This work is annotated throughout in what the British Museum authorities admit to be the handwriting of Francis Bacon, and upon the wide large-paper margin of the title-page eight similar scrolls appear which have evidently some (shall we say Rosicrucian ?) significance."

Setting to work on a rigid comparison between these scrolls in the booklet and the leading historic Rosicrucian symbols and emblems, I think I may fairly claim at length to have solved the mediate problem as to their origin and purport. The top sign appears to represent the Rosicrucian picture of the mirror of Pallas, the goddess of Wisdom, and the mark is therefore allied to Prudence or Circumspection. It lies with its circular frame to the reader's left. Underneath, to the extreme left and right of the reader, are fragments belonging to the left reading side of the Rosicrucian picture of Pluto's helmet of Invisibility.

In Chapter VII. on "Perseus or War" of Bacon's "Wisdom of the Ancients," one reads: "Now from that helmet which Pluto gave him (Perseus), powerful to make men invisible, the moral is plain." Mention is also here made of the "good use of Pallas's glass . . . but the best use of this glass is in the very point of danger." In Bacon's "Promus" allusion is again made to Pluto's helmet.

Now, the Rosicrucians were known as "the Invisibles." The standard picture of Pluto's helmet shows three Pythagorean serpent-figures of the numeral 3, each of which represented Time—Past, Present, and Future.

Strangely enough, in the reading right-hand side fragment the central (Present) curve is exaggerated into a loop towards the reading left. In the general grouping there are two long underlying horizontal lines, which appear to point to the special association of the two fragments. Further, there appear to be horizontal guiding lines added to both fragments on the actual reading left, and a detached one is shown on the reading left of the last scroll, which is central to the pictorial scheme. This scroll evidently represents the Rose, and nearest underlying devices, belonging to the central part of the standard picture of the "Rosicrucian Jewel," the emblem of the suffering, bleeding Pelican, self-wounded for the sake of its young.

A paraphrased translation of the Baconian pictorial conspectus would probably then read as follows: "I had to be cautious and hide my identity, and thereby suffer, while yet gladly working for and sustaining others."

Pursuing the analysis of the involved elements of Folio I. of the Northumberland MSS. I have come to the fixed conclusion that they are meant as parts of a twelve-sectioned Planisphere in keeping, as an Orbic message, with the combined mathematic and literary predilections of Francis Bacon.

Yours faithfully, HENRY WOOLLEN.

112, Coldershaw Road, West Ealing, W., June 3rd, 1912.

"De Shakespeare Nostrat:—Augustus in Hat."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I presume Mr. Parker Woodward must be making fun of your readers when he asks them to believe that "Augustus in Hat:" means "Augustus in a hat," and that it refers to a contemporary of Jonson, "whose hat was such a well-known feature." [*] It, of course, means "Augustus on Haterius," and refers to the words used by Augustus, "Haterius noster sufflaminandus est." I would add that it was probably this use of the word "noster" by Augustus that led Ben Jonson to make use of the abbreviated word "nostrat." Haterius was an illustrious orator at Rome at the time of Augustus, and was apparently so "fluent" that the latter said he must be "stopped."

Faithfully yours, SAMUEL WADDINGTON.

15, Cambridge Street, Hyde Park, W.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In "Bacon is Shakespeare" the author, referring to the reversal of a head ornament in "Camden's Remains," ed. 1616, writes, p. 114: "This trick of the upside down printing of ornaments, and even of engravings, is continually resorted to when some revelation concerning Bacon's works is given," and Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence has much documentary evidence to support his statement. I am reminded by it of a note which I made some years ago on the reversal of decorative strips above the plays in the first Folio. The peculiarities of the "Pan" head and tail pieces in that volume are, of course, well known to Baconians, but the mere strips may have escaped attention. They are of three patterns, which may be described as the leaf, the zigzag, and the marigold respectively. Although the plays are classified in the "catalogue" of the Folio as comedies, histories, and tragedies, no one of each of the three patterns is attributed to one class of play, as might, perhaps, have been expected. But I wish to point out the following facts: The plays are 36 in number, viz., 14 comedies, 10 histories, 11 tragedies, and the unclassified *Troilus and Cressida*. At the top of eleven plays is the "leaf" strip. In five cases it is upside down. At the top of twelve plays is the "zigzag," and in five cases it is upside down; and at the top of eleven plays is the "marigold," and in one case it is upside down, and in one other case significantly altered in a manner difficult to describe without an illustration. The pattern begins with a marigold and ends with a rose. If reversed, as when over *Henry V.*, it begins with a rose and ends with a marigold; but in the strip above the "First part of *Henry VI.*" the marigold is absent altogether, and its place is

[*] BACONIANA, April, 1912, p. 100.

supplied by another rose. Therefore a special block must have been cut for this one strip. No one familiar with the books of the period in question can suppose that such head strips as those to be found in so many of them were merely printers' ornaments. This very marigold strip is to be found, enlarged, above each of the four books into which "'A Relation of a Journey Begun An. Dom. 1610,' 3rd ed. by George Sandys, printed for Ro. Allot, London, 1627," is divided. The preface, although signed "George Sandys," is written in a style curiously resembling that of Francis Bacon, and the third book, containing "The History of the Holy Land," might well have come from his pen. The internal evidence that the writer had himself made the journey purporting to be described is faint. Now, the marigold head strip at the top of this third book is upside down.

Yours faithfully, J. R., OF GRAY'S INN.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR EDITOR,—May I draw the attention of your readers to a book translated from the Italian by Paolo Mussi, edited by George C. Williamson, Litt.D., and published by George Bell and Sons, 1903. The MS., of which it is a translation, consists of art notes, made in the sixteenth century, of pictures and other art treasures in Padua, Venice, Cremona, Milan, Pavia, etc. Its chief interest to us Baconians lies in the fact that no one knows, in Italy or elsewhere—at least, so the story goes—who the writer is. That he was "careful," "observant," "direct," "a man of means," and "high born," with an "art collection of his own," we are assured.

The MSS. was discovered by the Abate Don Jacopo Morelli in 1800, twenty-six years after the discovery of Montaigne's Diary, and was written, as I fancy, about the same time. It was in a collection of valuable MSS. known as the *Marciana*, made by Apostolo Zeno, a poet of Venice, born 1668, died 1750, and was left by him to the Dominicans of the Osservanza. It was so intrinsically valuable that by royal permission Morelli published it. Information in it enables lost pictures to be traced and found. Four mentioned in detail are now in Hampton Court and in the National Gallery. One in the Vienna Gallery was in the collection of Charles I., and one in the Duke of Buckingham's. We know that the Duke became possessed of York House, and one wonders was this picture once Bacon's? When I say that the title of this book is "*The Anonimo*," I feel sure the interest of all Baconians will be aroused.

Until now I have received no answer to a letter I have written to the editor asking if anything in the MS. militates against my notion that the book may have been written in the end, instead of the beginning, of the sixteenth century, as he suggests in the Preface. Certain dates, beginning with 1525, appear against certain houses visited. The last date is 1575. Do they mark the

date of the building of the houses rather than the date when they were visited ?

The last date precludes the book having been written when the editor suggests ; but as only three objects of art are mentioned as being in the house dated 1575 it is quite on the cards it was a newly built one. Was it only five years old ?

Is *Anonimo* Francis Bacon ?

Yours sincerely, ALICIA AMY LEITH.

June, 1912.

REVIEWS.

The Tragedy of Amy Robsart. A play in five acts. By HAROLD HARDY. Robert Banks & Son, Racquet Court, Fleet Street. Demy 8vo, 96 pp., paper covers, half-a-crown net.

MR. HAROLD HARDY is to be congratulated upon his appearance as a writer of dramatic poetry. "The Tragedy of Amy Robsart" is a production which will take high rank. Mr. Hardy seems to have thoroughly mastered the Elizabethan style of writing blank verse. His lines flow smoothly and have a pleasant effect on the musical ear. Amy Robsart's life is treated from a new point of view. It may not be in accordance with historical precedents, but the story as unfolded lends itself to the necessities of the drama. Leicester appears in a new light. Mr. Hardy certainly has made him a much more satisfactory character than he is usually painted. A fuller appreciation of the poem will follow in the next issue of BACONIANA.

The Mystery of Francis Bacon. By WILLIAM T. SMEDLEY. Robert Banks & Son. Crown 8vo, 5/- net.

THIS is an unpretentious little volume in which the writer seeks to trace Francis Bacon's influence in the production of the Elizabethan literature. Some new facts as to his early years unknown to modern biographers are brought to light. An attempt is made to produce evidence in support of the theory that from his earliest years Bacon sought to conceal his connection with literature, desiring that he should be seen only by his mind—that he adopted as his motto, "Mente Videbor."

The Shakespeare Problem Stated and Solved by Professor Gustav Holzer, of Heidelberg.[*]

PROFESSOR HOLZER, in this work, gives a business-like statement of the Baconian case. He does not amplify his conclu-

[*] "Das Shakespeare Problem," von Professor G. Holzer, Heidelberg, Weissische Universitas Buchandburg.

sions to any great extent—he leaves the facts to speak for themselves. But in his masterly summary the premises are so fully and clearly drawn that no one can resist the conclusion. It follows as a matter of necessity. The little book of 114 pages is divided into five sections, with three appendices—I. All the traditions handed down to us from the sixteenth century are described, and among them all he finds "Nicht für Shakespeare." II. Then all recent researches of the last few years are given, and they are distinctly "Jegen Shakespeare." III. Then follows a rapid summary of Bacon's life and works and aims. IV. Leaving the question of personal identity, the Professor spreads the pages of the poetry before him and derives from the inspection all that can be inferred of the poet's literary possessions—the results of study and literary culture; and V. finally he describes the purposes and aims of Shakespeare investigation. The appendices exhibit all the facts which make Bacon's authorship probable, and the obstacles that impede the recognition of Bacon's claim, even up to the present time. The title-page gives a replica of the vignette on the title-page of Peacham's "Minerva Britannica," in which the concealed author writes behind a curtain, his hand, holding a pen, being alone visible, with the encircling motto, "Vivitur ingenio, mente videbor cetera mortis erunt." A list of books bearing on the subject is supplied at the end, much the same as that on the cover of BACONIANA.

In all this there is little more than what all well-read Baconians are already familiar with, and on this account there is no special reason for publishing a translation. Our case is admirably presented to German readers. Professor Holzer himself has written no less than ten pamphlets. His pupils must be well posted in the Baconian arguments. R. M. THEOBALD.